





41

2832

AMENDMENT TRANSMITTAL LETTER			ATTORNEY'S DOCKET NO.: 0017-58 / H0001105 (4710)		
SERIAL NUMBER: 09/911,355	FILING DATE: July 23, 2001	EXAMINER: Ramon M. Barrera	GROUP ART UNIT: 2832		
INVENTION:					
HIGH PERFORMANCE BULK METAL MAGNETIC COMPONENT					
INVENTOR(s): Nicholas J. DeCristofaro et al.					
TO THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS: Transmitted herewith is an amendment in the above-identified application. The fee has been calculated as shown below.					
CLAIMS AS AMENDED					
(1)	(2) CLAIMS REMAINING AFTER AMENDMENT	(3)	(4) HIGHEST NUMBER PREVIOUSLY PAID FOR	(5) NO. OF EXTRA CLAIMS PRESENT	(6) RATE
TOTAL CLAIMS	**50	MINUS	*50	0	X \$18
INDEP. CLAIMS	**10	MINUS	*10	0	X \$84
TOTAL ADDITIONAL FEE FOR THIS AMENDMENT					\$ 0.00
<p>* If the entry in column 2 is less than the entry in column 4, write "0" in column 5. ** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 20, write "20" in this space. *** If the "Highest Number Previously Paid For" IN THIS SPACE is less than 3, write "3" in this space.</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No additional fee is required.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Charge \$ _____ to Deposit Account No. _____ A triplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The undersigned petitions for any extension of time for filing this document required under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 and requests that the \$ _____ fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 01-1125. A triplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Charge any additional fees to Deposit Account No. 01-1125</p>					
<u>September 2, 2003</u> Date			 Signature		
<u>(973) 644-0008</u> Phone			<u>Ernest D. Buff</u> Attorney Name		
<u>25,833</u> Reg. Number			<u>25,833</u> Reg. Number		
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile mail to the Commissioner for Patents, Attention Examiner Thiem D. Phan, at Facsimile Transmission No. (703) 872-9302 on <u>September 2, 2003</u> .					
<u>September 2, 2003</u> Date			 (Signature)		
<u>Ernest D. Buff</u> Attorney of Record			<u>Ernest D. Buff</u> Attorney of Record		
<u>September 2, 2003</u> (Date)			<u>September 2, 2003</u> (Date)		





IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Nicholas J. DeCristofaro et al. Group Art Unit: 2832
Serial No.: 09/911,355 Examiner: Ramon M. Barrera
Filed: July 23, 2001
For: **HIGH PERFORMANCE BULK METAL MAGNETIC COMPONENT**
Old Docket No.: H0001105
New Docket No.: 0170-58

Morristown, N.J. 07962
August 31, 2003

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

In response to the Office Action dated August 12, 2003, the following remarks are filed.

The Examiner has required restriction under 35 U.S.C. § 121 between the following inventions:

Group I. Claims 1-27, drawn to a high performance, low core loss bulk magnetic component, classified in class 335, subclass 296; and

Group II. Claims 28-50, drawn to a method for manufacturing a high performance, low core loss bulk magnetic component, classified in class 29, subclass 602.1.

In response to the restriction requirement, applicants elect, with traverse, the invention of Group I, claims 1-27 for further prosecution on the merits.

Reconsideration of this restriction requirement is respectfully requested. The Examiner has stated that the inventions, as grouped, are separate and distinct because (i) the component of Group I, as claimed, can be made by a materially different process, e.g. direct application of adhesive to each layer rather than by impregnation of several layers. Yet the relationship between (i) the high performance, low core loss bulk magnetic component of Group I, and (ii) the method of Group II for impregnating it with an adhesive bonding means which is thereafter activated to laminate the component layers, is an interdependent one, there being the same physical and structural concepts in the broad aspect of the invention.


RECEIVED
SEP 10 2003
TECHNOLOGY CENTER-2800

It is well established that applicants should be allowed reasonable latitude in claiming their invention, provided they do not unduly multiply the claims, which is not the case here. Ex parte Seiback 151 U.S.P.Q. 62. It is submitted that the fields of search involved in examining the claims as grouped would, as a practical matter, be essentially co-extensive and the best interests of the public would be served by having all of the claimed subject matter in the same application.

Accordingly, reconsideration of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested.

In view of the elections taken herein and the remarks set forth above, it is submitted that this application is in allowable condition. Accordingly, allowance of the application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,
Nicholas J. DeCristofaro et al.

By: 
Ernest D. Buff
(Their Attorney)
Reg. No. 25,833
(973) 644-0008